



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/677,619

10/02/2003

Craig Ogg

61135/P019US/10303184

8929

29053 7590 05/16/2008  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P  
2200 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER

JOSEPH, TONYA S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/16/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/677,619	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OGG, CRAIG	
	<b>Examiner</b> TONYA JOSEPH	<b>Art Unit</b> 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-12, 14-20 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-12, 14-20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/13/2008 has been entered.

### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20 and 22 were previously presented for Examination.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 19 have been amended. No Claims have been cancelled. No Claims have been added. Thus Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20 and 22 are again presented for examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### **112 2<sup>Nd</sup> Rejections**

The most previous Office Action rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A reproduction of the rejection is shown below:

1. Claims 1 and 11 recite the limitations regarding, “a postage computing device for separately calculating postage value due for each individual mail piece, said postage computing device operable to use said calculated postage value to generate an information based postage indicia for each individual mail piece in parallel with the mail piece being physically processed by a mail processing component of said two or more mail processing components” It is unclear if Applicant wishes to convey the structural elements of the mailing machine with conveyors that are parallel to one another or if the mailing machine is able to generate indicia while simultaneously processing another mail piece. For Examination purposes, Examiner is interpreting if the mailing machine is able to generate indicia while simultaneously processing another mail piece.

2. Claims 1 and 11 further recite the limitation “the mail piece being physically processed by a mail processing component” in line 8 and 10 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicant stated in the remarks, pg. 6 para. 2, that “*the parallel process is found in that the system is able to generate indicia for an individual mail piece while simultaneously processing that same individual mail piece*”. Contrarily, Applicant's newly amended claim language does not make this position clear nor does it clarify the previous claim limitation. Applicant's claim has been amended to recite:

a postage computing device for separately calculating postage value due **for each individual mail piece**, said postage computing device operable to use said calculated postage value to generate an information based postage indicia for **an individual mail piece** in parallel **with the individual mail piece being physically created and**

***processed*** by at least one mail processing component of said two or more mail processing components.

As the claim is currently presented, there appears to be three separate types of individual mail pieces:

***Mailpiece 1:*** The individual mail piece of the postage computing device.

***Mailpiece 2:*** An individual mail piece that will contain generated information based indicia.

***Mailpiece 3:*** The individual mail piece which is being physically created and processed by at least one mail processing component.

This is in glaring contrast to Applicant's remarks regarding the parallel process. It further makes the claim language unclear as to how many mail pieces are being discussed and the role of these individual mail pieces at various points throughout the system and their relation to the claimed process. Furthermore, there is a lack of antecedent basis for, "the individual mail piece being physically created and processed..."

For the reasons outlined above, the claim language is indefinite and unclear.

Accordingly for Examination purposes, the Examiner is interpreting Applicant's amendments with respect to claims 1 and 11 as not further limiting.

### 103 Rejections

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14-18 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of non-limiting amendment of Claim 1, as described above.

Claims 2 and 5-6

3. In response to applicant's argument that Chang does not teach performing quality control monitoring of a postage value calculated by a computing device, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim 4

Applicant's argument that merely adding a folder and an inserter on the front end of Freeman, "*would not produce a system which generates information based postage in parallel with the individual mail piece*" is inconsistent with Examiner's interpretation that mailing machine is able to generate indicia while simultaneously processing another mail piece. As such, the rejection is proper.

Furthermore, Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive due to the non-limiting amendment of Claim 1, as discussed above.

Claims 19-20

4. Claim 19 recites the limitation, "means for calculating a postage value for each individual mail piece ***based upon a count of the number of documents included in each mailpiece and weights of the documents, said weights determined***, and postage value calculated, ***without weighing the individual mail piece using information from said processing instructions***, and in parallel with the high-speed processing of said mail piece". It is unclear whether the "without weighing..." recitation

actually refers to the weights of the documents alone or both the documents and the mail piece. Applicant's amended claim, recites the weights of the documents are determined without weighing the individual mailpiece using information from the processing instructions. The lack of punctuation further makes the meaning of the limitation unclear. For Examination purposes, Examiner is interpreting Applicant's amendments as not further limiting.

5. Regarding claim 20, Applicant is reminded that the language, "capable of printing" is not as limiting as "prints". All a prior art reference, including Official Notice, has to show is that said reference is qualified to perform the actions and not that it actually performs it.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### **Claims 1 and 11**

Applicant's claim 1 has been amended to recite:

a postage computing device for separately calculating postage value due ***for each individual mail piece***, said postage computing device operable to use said calculated postage value to generate an information based postage indicia for ***an individual mail piece*** in parallel ***with the individual mail piece being physically created and***

**processed** by at least one mail processing component of said two or more mail processing components.

As the claim is currently presented, there appears to be three separate types of individual mail pieces:

**Mailpiece 1:** The individual mail piece of the postage computing device.

**Mailpiece 2:** An individual mail piece that will contain generated information based indicia.

**Mailpiece 3:** The individual mail piece which is being physically created and processed by at least one mail processing component.

This is in glaring contrast to Applicant's remarks regarding the parallel process (pg. 6 para. 2). It further makes the claim language unclear as to how many mail pieces are being discussed and the role of these individual mail pieces at various points throughout the system and their relation to the claimed process. Furthermore, **there is a lack of antecedent basis for the recitation, "the individual mail piece being physically created and processed..." (see line 7).**

8. Claim 11 recites similar claim limitations and also contains the same **lack of antecedent basis error** (see line 9).

For the reasons outlined above, the claim language is indefinite and unclear.

Accordingly for Examination purposes, the Examiner is interpreting Applicant's amendments with respect to claims 1 and 11 as not further limiting.



9. Claim 19 recites the limitation, “means for calculating a postage value for each individual mail piece ***based upon a count of the number of documents included in each mailpiece and weights of the documents, said weights determined***, and postage value calculated, ***without weighing the individual mail piece using information from said processing instructions***, and in parallel with the high-speed processing of said mail piece”. It is unclear whether the “without weighing...” recitation actually refers to the weights of the documents alone or both the documents and the mail piece. Additionally, the lack of punctuation further makes the plain meaning of the limitation unclear. For Examination purposes, Examiner is interpreting Applicant's amendments as not further limiting.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1.

12. As per Claim 1, Freeman teaches, a postage computing device for separately calculating postage value due for each individual mail piece (see Col. 2 lines 11-17), said postage computing device operable to use said calculated postage value to

Art Unit: 3628

generate postage indicia for an individual mail piece in parallel with the individual mail piece being physically created and processed by at least one mail processing component of said two or more mail processing components (see Col. 9 lines 33-40). a postage application printer positioned to print said postage indicia on a corresponding one of the mail pieces that are being moved by the conveyor system (see Col. 9 lines 47-48), wherein said postage indicia is available for printing by said postage application printer at the time the corresponding one of the mail pieces arrives at said postage application printer (see Col. 9 lines 50-52); Freeman does not explicitly teach the system taught by Leon, a computer processing system for storing information related to the processing of each mail piece and for providing the controller with the processing information (see para. 96). Although Freeman does not teach information based indicia, Leon further teaches generate information based indicia and printing information based indicia (see para. 87; 45 and 46). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Freeman to include the teachings of Leon in order to make share information regarding items to be posted accessible and use technological advances in computers and their networks, as taught by Leon para. 96 and 73.

13. Claims 2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 in further view of Chang et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,612,888.

Art Unit: 3628

14. As per Claim 2, Freeman in view of Leon teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach a quality control unit for monitoring the postage value calculated by the postage computing device. Chang teaches a quality control unit for monitoring the postage value calculated by the postage computing device (see Col. 3 lines 10-14). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Chang in order to maintain integrity in the event of a fault, as taught in Chang Col. 3 lines 10-14.

15. As per Claim 5, Freeman in view of Leon teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach wherein the controller and the computer processing system are the same device. Chang teaches the controller and the computer processing system are the same device (see Col. 2 lines 38-43 and Col. 3 lines 10-14). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Chang in order to enable a flexible architecture, as taught in Chang Col. 3 lines 5-7.

16. As per Claim 6, Freeman in view of Leon teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach wherein the controller, the computer processing system and the postage computing device are the same device. Chang teaches wherein the controller, the computer processing system and the postage computing device are the same device (see Col. 2 lines 38-43). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify

the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Chang in order to enable a flexible architecture, as taught in Chang Col. 3 lines 5-7.

17. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 in further view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 6,041,569 (Hereinafter, "Freeman 2").

18. As per Claim 7, Freeman in view of Chang teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach the system taught by Freeman 2, wherein the postage application printer is a high-speed ink jet printer (see Col. 7 lines 57-62). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Freeman 2 in order to enable high speed indicia printing.

19. Claims 3-4 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 in further view of Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1.

20. As per Claim 3, Freeman in view of Leon teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach a mail piece printer for printing documents that will be combined into the mail pieces. Ryan teaches a mail piece printer for printing documents that will be combined into the mail pieces (see Col. 5 lines 23-30). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Ryan to produce high volume mail-pieces, as taught in Ryan Col. 5 lines 31-35.

21. As per Claim 4, Freeman in view of Leon teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach wherein the mail processing components include at least one of a folder and an inserter. Ryan teaches the mail processing components include a folder and an inserter (see Col. 5 lines 20-21 and Col. 6 lines 45-52). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Ryan to produce customized documents corresponding to an individual customer account.

22. As per Claim 9, Freeman in view of Leon teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach wherein the postage application prints other information on one or more of the mail pieces in addition to the postage information. Ryan teaches the postage application prints other information on one or more of the mail pieces in addition to the postage information (see Col. 7 lines 29-34). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Ryan to allow address information to be included for mailpiece delivery.

23. As per Claim 10, Freeman in view of Ryan teaches the system of claim 9 as described above. Freeman does not explicitly teach wherein the additional information includes one or more items selected from the group consisting of: marketing information; address information; and an envelope border. Ryan teaches wherein the

additional information includes one or more items selected from the group consisting of: marketing information; address information; and an envelope border (see Col. 7 lines 29-34). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Ryan to allow address information to be included for mailpiece delivery.

24. Claims 11-12, 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1 in view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in further view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1.

25. As per Claim 11, Ryan teaches receiving processing instructions that identify how each mail piece should be processed (see Col. 4 lines 17-28); controlling the components of the high-speed processing system to comply with the processing instructions (Col. 4 lines 13-28); calculating a postage value for each individual mail piece (see Col. 7 lines 12-14); and printing the calculated postage value on each mail piece (see Col. 7 lines 1-4). Ryan does not explicitly teach the method taught by Freeman; generating postage indicia, using said calculated postage value, for an individual mail piece in parallel with the individual mail piece being physically processed for one or more of the components, including at least one of a folder and an inserter of said high-speed mail processing system (see Col. 9 lines 33-40).; and wherein said postage indicia is available for printing at the same time the corresponding one of the mail pieces arrives at a printer for said printing (see Col. 9 lines 50-52). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ryan to include the teachings of Freeman to provide a mixed

Art Unit: 3628

weight mailing system having improved singulating capability, as taught in Freeman Col. 2 lines 3-5. Although Freeman does not teach information based indicia, Leon further teaches generate information based indicia and printing information based indicia (see para. 87; 45 and 46). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the systems of Ryan and Freeman to include the teachings of Leon in order to use technological advances in computers and their networks, as taught by Leon para. 96 and 73.

26. As per Claim 12, Ryan in view of Freeman and Leon teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Ryan further teaches folding the mail pieces (see Col. 6 lines 45-47); inserting the mail pieces into an envelope (see Col. 6 lines 52-54); and printing the calculated postage on each envelope (see Col. 7 lines 1-4).

27. As per Claim 15, Ryan in view of Freeman and Leon teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Ryan further teaches printing other information on one or more of the mail pieces in addition to the postage value for that piece (see Col. 7 lines 29-34).

28. As per Claim 16, Ryan in view of Freeman and Leon teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Ryan further teaches wherein the other information includes one or more items selected from the group consisting of: marketing information; address information; and an envelope border (see Col. 7 lines 29-34).

29. As per Claim 18, Ryan in view of Freeman and Leon teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Ryan further teaches printing documents to be included in each mail piece prior to folding the mail piece (see Col. 5 lines 65-67).

30. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1 in view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in further view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 and Manduley et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,079,714.

31. As per Claim 14, Ryan teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Ryan does not explicitly teach wherein the postage value is calculated without weighing the mail pieces. Manduley teaches wherein the postage value is calculated without weighing the mail pieces (see Col. 8 lines 39-44). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Ryan, Freeman and Leon to include the teachings of Manduley in order to utilize a computer which maintains a database and inserts of their weights, as taught in Manduley Col. 8 lines 40-44.

32. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1 in view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in further view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 and Chang et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,612,888.

33. As per Claim 17, Ryan in view of Freeman in further view of Leon teaches the method of Claim 11 as described above. Ryan does not explicitly teach, performing a quality control analysis on one or more of the calculated postage values. Chang teaches performing a quality control analysis on one or more of the calculated postage values (see Col. 3 lines 10-14). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Ryan, Freeman and Leon to



include the teachings of Chang in order to maintain integrity in the event of a fault, as taught in Chang Col. 3 lines 10-14.

34. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1 in view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in further view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 and Rasmussen et al. 20040088267 A1.

35. As per Claim 19, Ryan teaches means for receiving processing instructions that identify how each mail piece should be processed (see Col. 4 lines 17-28); means for controlling the components of a high-speed processing system in accordance with the processing instructions (see Col. 4 lines 13-28); and a printer for printing the calculated postage value on each mail piece (see Col. 7 lines 1-4). Ryan does not explicitly teach the system taught by Rasmussen means for calculating a postage value for each individual mail piece based upon a count of the number of documents included in each said individual mail piece and weights of the documents; said weights determined, and postage value calculated, without weighing the individual mailpiece using information from said processing instructions, and in parallel with the high-speed processing of said mail piece (see para. 12 and para. 13). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ryan to include the teachings of Rasmussen to determine weight based deliver fee, as taught by Rasmussen para. 3.

36. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1 in view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in

further view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 and Rasmussen et al. 20040088267 A1 and Official Notice.

37. As per Claim 20, Ryan teaches the method of claim 19 as described above. Ryan further does not explicitly teach wherein the printer is a high-speed printer that is capable of printing the postage value at any position or orientation on the mail pieces. Official Notice is taken that a high-speed printer that is capable of printing at any position or orientation is old and well known. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Ryan to include the teachings of Official Notice in order to speed up processing times.

38. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Ryan, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,274 B1 in view of Freeman U.S. Patent No. 4,742,878 in further view of Leon U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0042052 A1 and Rasmussen et al. 20040088267 A1.

39. As per Claim 22, Ryan in view of Freeman and Leon teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Ryan does not explicitly teach the method taught by Rasmussen, wherein a weight of each mail piece varies depending upon the number of pages included in each mail piece (see para. 13 and 18), and wherein the postage value for each mail piece is calculated based upon a count of the number of pages included for that mail piece and weights of the pages (see para. 13). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ryan to include the teachings of Rasmussen to determine weight based deliver fee, as taught by Rasmussen para. 3.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TONYA JOSEPH whose telephone number is (571)270-1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30am-5:00pm First Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571 272 0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tonya Joseph  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3628

/JOHN W HAYES/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628

